

Assessment Report

Level 3 Business Studies 2017

Standards **91379** **91380** **91381**

Part A: Commentary

The performance across the standards continues to improve. The changes that allow candidates to answer 91379 or 91380 using their own business context have allowed more access to the papers and will encourage greater inquiry learning in classrooms.

Improving how students write is critically important to improving achievement especially at the higher-grade boundaries.

There is a tendency for some less prepared candidates to offer an explanation plus an immediate statement on the impact on profit. This is an insufficient step-up from Achieved and therefore not evidence for Merit.

It would be beneficial to see further improvements at Excellence. Summaries or repetition of ideas do not demonstrate a comprehensive understanding. Evaluation involves understanding the impacts in relation to the specific business context chosen. This may involve long-term impacts or alternatives courses of action. Further detail is given at - <https://seniorsecondary.tki.org.nz/Social-sciences/Business-studies/Learning-objectives/Achievement-grades-Level-3>

Part B: Report on Standards

91379: Demonstrate understanding of how internal factors interact within a business that operates in a global context

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained their answer and the reasons to why their chosen business would benefit from introducing product innovation linking their response to increased/improved staff motivation and productivity
- could explain Quality Circles or Quality Control in relation to improving the quality of their games / global business studied
- had difficulty relating Total Quality Management approach including the supply chain and customer feedback to improve the quality of their games
- gave more than one negative and one positive by using many consecutive “also” statements (all possible positive/negative impacts i.e. what and how).

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- misinterpreted the WHY a change management strategy is necessary
- chose a specific strategy and discussed it at great length, showing business knowledge but their response did not answer the question given. Most common strategy discussed was the Kubler-Ross grief cycle. They did not state any relevant examples from the stimulus or from their own business material
- went off topic. For example, when explaining a positive for Kemu of the inclusive change management approach, students referred to ideas for better design of VR games without discussing how this will affect transition of Kemu to use new technology.
- did not link their response to the effect on premium pricing and/or revenue and profitability in the long run.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- could integrate their business knowledge by linking impacts to other functional areas of the business and were able to use the what, why and how technique to fully explain most answers
- reiterated the points made previously for positive and negative impacts without offering any new information to gain the “justified.” It was quite specifically asked for in the bullet point in parts (b) and (d).

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- could comprehensively explain a positive and a negative of the chosen quality management strategy and inclusive change management strategy in the context of their global business or using their given stimulus
- provided a fully evaluated, justified conclusion that included new information that focused on why the judgement they made was justifiable within the context of the business.

Standard specific comments

Some candidates tended to get off topic or provided explanations that were not required. Students need to work on answering the questions and structuring their answers more effectively and be more succinct.

In part (d) more candidates were able to fully explain Quality Control and Quality Circles better than those who chose TQM. This is because very few students related TQM to the whole business approach including the supply chain and customer feedback.

To gain Excellence candidates needed to fully explain both a cost/negative and a benefits/positive effect to be able to provide a justified conclusion. Candidates must not just simply sum up what they have already said, but must also include new information.

91380: Demonstrate understanding of strategic response to external factors by a business that operates in a global context

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- stated a strategic response and explained why it is a business wide reaction in terms of either size, scope or time
- structured their paragraphs using linking words such as ‘because’ or ‘therefore’ to show why the problem or decision occurred

- gave direct impacts on profit that lacked full explanation.
- stated some business terminology such as 'profit' instead of 'money'.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not explain "why" the response was a "business-wide" reaction
- unable to state the strategic response
- gave an answer that explained the effects if the strategic response did not work – rather than a negative impact of the response
- only explained what kaitiakitanga is but not the impact on the operations of the business
- gave answers about the cultural concerns between the business and its customers - not about the cultural concerns between the local managers and foreign sales team
- did not answer one or more parts of the question.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- clearly stated the "what" and "why" required for achieved before fully explaining with the "how"/flow-on effects for the business/stakeholders required for merit
- gave more than a simple "how" (for example "increased profits") by fully explaining how this was achieved (for example through lower expenditure or greater sales/market share)
- used the context of the question/a business they have studied in depth.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- could successfully use the context of the question to bring new information to their justified conclusion. This information added further positive reasoning to the response that they had already given (for example that the business was owned by Iwi and thus they would prefer to retain control and prefer the given response to a merger).
- compared and contrasted their strategic response with the alternative option given in the context/question (a merger in part (a)).

Standard specific comments

Candidates are generally adept at the achieved and merit levels, but seem to have difficulty in understanding what is required of them at the excellence level. Many attempted to explain the impacts on the long-term sustainability of the business by comparing and contrasting short and long-term effects but did so by repeating information already given in their answer.

91381: Apply business knowledge to address a complex problem(s) in a given global business context

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- systematically answered all questions using information from the resource booklet and their own business knowledge
- tended to explain the effects well and provide a basic recommendation
- used the resource material and had a good understanding of basic business terms and knowledge
- related their responses back to Kete Kai by explaining the cause of or effects on the business.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- stated rather than explained causes and effects
- failed to complete all questions

- demonstrated little business knowledge
- failed to refer to the resource material.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- demonstrated an ability to fully explain the cause or effects for Kete Kai, rather than simply stating or explaining in general i.e. increase sales and increase profit
- demonstrated a deeper understanding of applying business knowledge to this particular business
- were able to competently use business terms
- used the resource material well
- provided little if any additional information in the justification for tasks (c) and (d).

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- demonstrated a thorough understanding of cause, effect and solutions for the business expansion
- demonstrated high levels of business knowledge
- integrated resource material well and then added layers of information to support their ideas
- clearly justified their recommendation with original material, not merely a repeat of the earlier material relating to the effect on the business.

Standard specific comments

Solutions were provided in the resource, which is a change some candidates preferred.

Candidates it most challenging to demonstrate higher thinking in question four and provided the weakest answers overall for this question. Many candidates were unable to fully explain the effect of each solution (fridge). Many included info such as the fridge has bigger doors and were then limited as to how they could fully explain the effect of this for KK. Providing additional material for the justification was very difficult for the vast majority of students.

The overall level of responses/answers was of a higher standard than last year, particularly for explained answers, enabling student to achieve. The improvements over the past few years have continued. Candidates appeared to know what they needed to do to achieve and to have read the resource material. The majority of students wrote sound, explained answers.

Business Studies subject page

Previous years' reports

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority